



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

In point of fact, none of the topics dealt with in this chapter can be definitely disposed of until the MSS themselves are carefully examined; facsimiles are insufficient. Furthermore, if one is to write a history of the evolution of the script and of the development of local schools, the cursive scripts must be included in the investigation. Professor Clark has cleared the way for such a work and has greatly lightened the task for his successor.

The last chapter is devoted to the transcription of the plates, with a detailed description of the MSS and comments on the script. The plates, seventy in number, are from photographs made, with but few exceptions, by Professor Clark himself; apparently a hand camera, 5 by 7 inches, was used. Most of them can be read without the use of a glass. While reduced facsimiles of this sort are not practicable for paleographical exercises they are quite satisfactory for the study of the script, and further publication of such facsimiles should be encouraged. The great cost of the larger publications has been a handicap to paleographical study. There is room also for inexpensive photographs of entire MSS in reduced format alongside the sumptuous reproductions of the Leyden series.

CHARLES H. BEESON

Titi Livi ab urbe condita recognoverunt Carolus Flamstead Walters et Robertus Seymour Conway. Tomus II, libri VI-X. Oxonii, e typographo Clarendoniano, MDCCCCXIX.

With the appearance of this volume we have at last a trustworthy text and apparatus of the first decade of Livy, and a great reproach to classical scholarship has thus been removed. It is not that the Teubner text was not a good one—there are no startling changes in the Oxford edition—but we now know where we stand and can feel sure that we have all the evidence before us.

We are reminded in the Preface that seven MSS hitherto unknown or unused have been added to the apparatus, that the important MSS already known have been recollated and that the *deteriores* have been re-examined. The collations of Alschefski and Frigelli, though better than most collations of their day, were faulty, often contradicting each other, and could not be trusted. The editors have not accepted even Dianu's careful collation of the Thuaneus, but have made a new collation and verified all the discrepancies between Dianu's and their own, so that we may feel sure we have an accurate report on the readings of this important MS. This codex, by the way, is a ninth-, not a tenth-century MS, as I hope to show elsewhere, and the corrector did his work about the middle of the ninth century; he is certainly the scribe who wrote the first pages of the codex.

The reason why we have had to wait so long for a satisfactory edition of the first decade is obvious; few classical texts require more drudgery and

fruitless labor in their preparation than the first ten books of Livy. Frigelli spent more than twenty years in preparing his *Collatio codicum Livianorum*, libri I-III, 1878; the English editors, with the help of a number of colleagues, published their first volume only after thirteen years of preparation (1914), and the second volume required an additional five years. The successful completion of this laborious task is an achievement in which they may well take pride.

The Preface gives a list of the MSS used but refers the reader to the Preface of Volume I for a detailed description. Several pages are devoted, however, to the Medicenean codex, and the good and bad qualities of this MS are well depicted; several pages also are devoted to a discussion of the MSS used by Gelenius. A clever attempt has been made to reconstruct the (uncial) archetype of our MSS, even to the number of letters in a line, and the text has been emended on this basis in a number of places. It is unfortunate that the editors did not indicate, at least in a general way, their view as to the history of the text. Their general impressions, crystallized after an intensive study of so many years, would have been of great value. No one now undertaking this task can hope to attain such a mastery of details as they possess. The MSS groups stand out clearly enough, but we should like to know their final conclusions regarding the interrelationship of the groups and of the separate MSS, the script of the various archetypes, etc.

The apparatus has the same excellent features as that of Volume I: exactness in giving the readings of the MSS, explanation of errors, discussion of variants and emendations, etc.; reference is occasionally made to discussions, especially to *Classical Quarterly* XII (1918), 1, 98, 113. The paleographical comments are interesting but in some cases are open to criticism; e.g., VIII 36, 6, *circuit scripsi*, the editor apparently interprets *circū* (POHD) as *circum*, which is the reading of MFTLA, and gives a cross-reference to III, 51, 7, where F has *quieū*. Here the statement is explicit: "quieū F [i.e., qui eum (*sed fortasse voluit scriba quievit*)]." Now the use of an abbreviating stroke for the third singular verb ending -it is well established; in fact, it is found in X, 33, 1, where A has *induc* and our editor correctly interprets it as *inducit*. There can be no doubt that the scribe, whether of F or its archetype, who first wrote *quieū* meant *quierit* not *qui eum*, and F should be cited along with the mass of MSS, which have *quievit*; similarly we should regard *circuit* as the reading attested by POHD. These scribes may have thought they were writing *circum*—in fact the scribes of MFTLA wrote *circum*—but if Livy wrote *circuit*, as the editor assumes, the original *circū* meant *circuit*; in other words, if an abbreviation is capable of more than one interpretation it should be expanded into the reading admitted into the text, if the other reading is impossible. The suggestion that the reading *qui* for *quam*, found in H at VII, 18, 7, is due to a mistaken abbreviation for *quam* (*qu* with a superscript abbreviating

stroke that was mistaken for *i*) seems unlikely; such an abbreviation for *quam* would be an anomaly; *q* with an abbreviating stroke through the tail was probably the cause of the error. In the majority of cases where our editor is in doubt whether a correction in the Thuanus is to be attributed to T², or to T¹ or T³, I agree with Dianu in attributing it to T²; in some cases the reference mark makes the attribution almost certain. The compendium in IX, 44, 2, if correctly printed, stands for *est*, not *et*.

There is no index and the reader will still find use for his Teubner text.

CHARLES H. BEESON

P. *Vergili Maronis opera post Ribbeckium tertium recognovit Gualtherus Ianell.* Editio Maior. Lipsiae in aedibus B. G. Teubneri, MCMXX. Pp. xxviii+428.

Ribbeck's great critical edition of Virgil has undergone a gradual process of contraction. His first edition required three good-sized volumes for the text, the second (1894, 1895) was reduced by more than a third, and the present volume contains only about half as many pages as the second edition; the format has been reduced to that of the ordinary Teubner text. The *Appendix Vergiliana* has been omitted, the *testimonia* have disappeared, and the apparatus has shrunk, in some places almost to the vanishing point of usefulness.

In the first ten pages of the Preface the editor states the principles he has followed in constituting the text and apparatus. His announced purpose is to free the text from Ribbeck's often reckless changes and restore the tradition. He has made no new examination of the MSS previously used; the readings of M, which he regards as the "best" MS, are taken from Hoffman's collation; those of F, which he classes as second in value, are derived from the Vatican reproduction. He cites occasionally readings from a Codex Rehdigeranus, a MS of the twelfth century, which he collated at Norden's suggestion. He has examined the external evidence also, including the centones, which Ribbeck disregarded.

In matters of orthography the editor has not attempted to reproduce the variations of spelling of the MSS; hence *-om* after *u* and *v* everywhere; following Gellius he spells *ahenus* everywhere. A few innovations occur, e.g., *Aeptyus* for *Eptyus*, *Elymus* for *Helymus*, *Herulum* for *Erulum*, *Hortinae* for *Ortinae*, *Mevius* for *Maevius*, *Mezzentius* for *Mezentius* and *Phthia* for *Phthia*; the spelling with *g* instead of *c* has been adopted in such forms as *Agmon*, *Aragas*, *Cygnus*, *Gnosus*, *Ognus*, *Progne*, *Pyramon*. In punctuation the Codex Mediceus has been followed as far as practicable.

The Preface also contains the text of the *Vita Donatiana*, based on eight MSS, the *Serviana*, based on eight MSS, and the *Vita Probi*, based on four MSS. Three pages are devoted to the *testimonia*.